RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
JAN 21 2009

IN THE UNITED STATES
PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Attorney Docket No.: **Google-38 (GP-100-00-US)**

Appl. No.: **10/674,056**

Applicant/Appellant: **Georges R. HARIK**

Filed: **September 29, 2003**

Title: GENERATING INFORMATION FOR ONLINE ADVERTISEMENTS FROM INTERNET DATA AND TRADITIONAL MEDIA DATA

TC/A.U.: **2161**

Examiner: **Kavita Padmanabhan**

Mail Stop Appeal Brief-Patents
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

S I R:

## APPEAL BRIEF

Further to the Notice of Appeal filed on September 19, 2008, which set a period for response to expire on November 19, 2008, that period being extended two (2) months to expire on January 19, 2009, the appellant requests that the Board reverse all outstanding grounds of rejection in view of the following.

1/21/2009 HMARZI1 00000011 501049 10674056
2 FC:1402 540.00 DA

## I. Real Party In Interest

The real party in interest is Google, Inc. An assignment of the above-referenced patent application from the inventors to Google, Inc. was recorded in the Patent Office starting at Frame 0161 of Reel 016047.

## II. Related Appeals and Interference

There are no related appeals or interferences.

## III. Status of Claims

Claims 1-5, 29-33 and 57-78 are pending.

Claims 1-5, 29-33 and 57-78 are rejected. Specifically, claims 67-70, 72-74 and 76-78 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement; and claims 1-5, 29-33 and 57-78 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,876,997 ("the Rorex patent") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,269,361 ("the Davis patent").

Please note that although claims 29-33 and 62-66 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 in the final Office Action (Paper No. 20080513), said rejections were withdrawn by the Examiner in the Advisory Action dated January 14, 2009 (Paper No. 20090113).

The foregoing rejections of claims 1-5, 29-33 and 57-78 are appealed.

## IV. Status of Amendments

An After Final Amendment was filed on October 3, 2008 subsequent to the final Office Action (Paper No. 20080513).

In the Advisory Action dated January 14, 2009 (Paper No. 20090113), the Examiner entered the amendments included in the After Final Amendment filed on October 3, 2008 and noted that said amendments overcame the rejections of claims 29-33 and 62-66 under 35 U.S.C. § 101.

## V. Summary of the Claimed Subject Matter

Generally, embodiments consistent with the claimed invention help advertisers to (1) select a landing page, (2) select or target appropriate Web pages (or "documents") to advertise on, and/or (3) create an ad creative that will be used to entice users to select their ad. (See page 6, lines 3-6 of the present application.) To this end, embodiments consistent with the claimed invention may do so by generating online advertisements from Internet data by automatically determining all three of the above components for an advertiser. This advantageously alleviates the large amount of work required on behalf of the advertiser to manually identify and select appropriate landing pages for ad creatives, and to generate high quality ad creatives. In one embodiment consistent with the claimed invention, this is done by analyzing the advertiser's Website and possibly other related Websites to identify the information to be used in generating an ad creative. (See page 16, lines 6-10 of the present application.)

Independent 1 recites a method for generating information for an online advertisement, the method comprising:

a) generating a first plurality of search results using a search query and an index of advertiser Web page

information (This is supported, for example, by 505, 510, 530 and 540 of Figure 5, and page 16, line 20 through page 17, line 17.);

b) determining, for each of the first plurality of search results, at least one of (A) landing page information and (B) ad creative information using a corresponding one of the first plurality of search results (This is supported, for example, by 350 and 370 of Figure 3, 550, 552 and 554 of Figure 5, and page 16, line 1 through page 17, line 17.);

c) generating, for each of the first plurality of search results, an ad using the determined at least one of a landing page information and ad creative information (This is supported, for example, by 350 and 370 of Figure 3, 540, 550, 552 and 554 of Figure 5, and page 16, line 1 through page 17, line 17.); and

d) generating a search result page including (i) at least a second plurality of search results corresponding to the search query, and (ii) the generated ads (This is supported, for example, by 505, 510, 515 and 520 of Figure 5, page 9, lines 24-27, page 10, line 19 through page 11, line 20, and page 16, line 1 through page 17, line 17.),

wherein the generated ads are maintained as distinct from the second plurality of search results on the search result page (This is supported, for example, by page 11, lines 18-20.), and

wherein the second plurality of search results is a predetermined number (This is supported, for example, by page 10, lines 25-28.).

Corresponding independent apparatus claim 29 recites corresponding apparatus comprising one or more processors, at least one input device, and one or more storage devices storing processor-executable instructions which, when executed by one or more processors, perform the acts of generating, determining, generating and generating recited in the method of independent claim 1. In addition to the support for the corresponding method acts cited above, claim 29 is supported, for example, by Figure 10, page 7, lines 5-8 of the present application, and the amendments to the specification on pages 3-5 of the amendment filed on July 6, 2007.

## VI. Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

The issues presented for review are whether:

(1) (separately patentable and argued groups of) claims 67-70, 72-74 and 76-78 were properly rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement; and

(2) (separately patentable and argued groups of) claims 1-5, 29-33 and 57-78 are properly rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Rorex patent in view of the Davis patent.

## VII. Argument

The appellant respectfully requests that the Board reverse the final rejection of claims 1-5, 29-33 and 57-78 in view of the following.

### Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 67-70, 72-74 and 76-78 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The appellant respectfully requests that the Board reverse this ground of rejection in view of the following.

***Group I: Claims 67-70***

In rejecting claims 67-70, the Examiner contends that:

> there does not appear to be support in the applicant's original specification for the limitation "*the predetermined number of the second plurality of search results is independent of a number of ads included on the generated search result page*" or "*the predetermined number of the second plurality of search results is more than a number of the ads included on the generated search result page.*"

(Paper No. 20080513, page 2) The appellant respectfully disagrees.

The original specification provides:

> Another example of an ad consumer 130 is the search engine 220. A search engine 220 may receive queries for search results. In response, the search engine may retrieve relevant search results (e.g., from an index of Web pages). ... Such ***search results*** may

> include, for example, lists of Web page titles, snippets of text extracted from those Web pages, and hypertext links to those Web pages, and ***may be grouped into a predetermined number of (e.g., ten) search results***.
>
> The search engine 220 may submit a request for ads to the ad server 120/210. The request may include a number of ads desired. This number may depend on the search results, the amount of screen or page space occupied by the search results, the size and shape of the ads, etc. In one embodiment, the ***number of desired ads will be from one to ten, and preferably from three to five***. [Emphasis added.]

(Page 10, line 19 through page 11, line 2 of the specification) As can be appreciated from the foregoing, the specification provides that a search engine may retrieve relevant search results and that the search results may be grouped into a predetermined number of (e.g., ten) search results. No where does the specification state that the number of predetermined search results depends on the number of ads shown. In addition, since the specification clearly provides that the ***number of ads requested may depend on the search results***, and does not state that the number of search results are dependent on the number of ads, it is clearly implied that the number of search results is independent from the number of ads included in the generated search results page. Thus, one skilled in the art would reasonably conclude that the appellant had possession of the claimed invention.

Furthermore, the above cited portion of the specification clearly supports that the number of search results can be more than a number of the generated ads included on the generated search result page.

Thus, in view of the foregoing remarks, claims 67-70 meet the written description requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph.

***Group II: Claims 72 and 76***

In rejecting claims 72 and 76, the Examiner contends that:

> there does not appear to be support in the applicant's original specification for the limitation "*the ad creative information is determined using information automatically extracted from an advertiser Web page.*"

(Paper No. 20080513, page 3) The appellant respectfully disagrees.

The original specification provides:

> Referring back to Figure 3, consistent with the present invention, ***ad creative generation operations 350 may be used to generate ad creative information*** 320, ad targeting determination operations 360 may be used to generate serving constraints 330, and/or ad landing page selection operations 370 may be used to generate landing page information (e.g., a link to a landing page) 340. Thus, the ***present invention may generate online advertisements from Internet data by automatically determining all of the three above components for an advertiser.*** In one embodiment of the present invention, ***this is done by analyzing the advertiser's Website and possibly other related Websites.***

(Page 16, lines 1-10) As can be appreciated from the foregoing, the specification clearly provides that the ad creative information is automatically determined using advertiser Web pages. Furthermore, original claims 2 and 30

further support this feature. In view of this information, one skilled in the art would reasonably conclude from the above cited portion of the specification that the appellant had possession of the claimed invention.

Thus, in view of the foregoing remarks, claims 72 and 76 meet the written description requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph.

*Group III: Claims 73 and 77*

In rejecting claims 73 and 77, the Examiner contends that the sections of the specification cited by the appellant fail to support the claims. (Paper No. 20080513, page 3) Claims 73 and 77 are supported, for example, by original claims 3 and 31, Figures 3 and 5, and page 16, line 1 through page 17, line 10 of the specification.

Thus, in view of the foregoing support, claims 73 and 77 meet the written description requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph.

***Group IV: Claims 74 and 78***

In rejecting claims 74 and 78, the Examiner contends that:

> there does not appear to be support in the applicant's original specification for the limitation "*the ad creative information includes information automatically extracted from an advertiser Web page.*"

(Paper No. 20080513, page 3) The appellant respectfully disagrees.

The original specification provides:

> Referring back to Figure 3, consistent with the present invention, ***ad creative generation operations 350 may be used to generate ad creative information*** 320, ad targeting determination operations 360 may be used to generate serving constraints 330, and/or ad landing page selection operations 370 may be used to generate landing page information (e.g., a link to a landing page) 340. Thus, the ***present invention may generate online advertisements from Internet data by automatically determining all of the three above components for an advertiser.*** In one embodiment of the present invention, ***this is done by analyzing the advertiser's Website and possibly other related Websites.***

(Page 16, lines 1-10) As can be appreciated from the foregoing, the specification provides that the ad creative information can include information automatically extracted using advertiser Web pages. Furthermore, original claims 4 and 32 further support this feature. In view of this information, one skilled in the art would reasonably conclude from the above cited portion of the specification that the appellant had possession of the claimed invention.

Thus, in view of the foregoing remarks, claims 74 and 78 meet the written description requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph.

**Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 1-5, 29-33 and 57-78 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable the Rorex patent in view of the Davis patent. The appellant respectfully requests that the Board reverse this ground of rejection in view of the following.

***Group I: Claims 1-5, 29-33, 58, 59, 61, 63, 64, 66-71, 73-75, 77 and 78***

Independent claims 1 and 29 are not rendered obvious by the Rorex and Davis patents because the cited references neither teach, nor make obvious, that the generated ads are maintained as distinct from the second plurality of search results on the search result page and that the second plurality of search results is a predetermined number.

In the Davis patent, neither the number of paid listings (characterized by the Examiner as the first plurality of search results), nor the number of unpaid listings (characterized by the Examiner as the second plurality of search results), is predetermined. As in the Rorex patent, the unpaid listings are displayed "following the lowest-ranked paid listing." (See, e.g., the Davis patent, col. 18, lines 26-28.) Furthermore, the Davis patent states, "[p]referably, unpaid listings are displayed if there are an insufficient number of listings to fill the 40 slots in a search results page." (Col. 18, lines 28-30)

Although the total number of "slots" available for search results (paid and unpaid listings) may be predetermined, the number of displayed ads and the number of unpaid listings are not known until a search query for relevant ads has been completed. ***Only if there are an insufficient number of listings to fill the slots in a search page can the number of unpaid listings be determined***. Thus, the number of unpaid listings is not ***predetermined***, but can only be known ***after*** all relevant paid listings have been used. In fact, in some instances, the Davis patent might not have any slots available to display unpaid listings.

In view of the foregoing remarks, the Rorex and Davis patents do not teach that the second plurality of search results is a ***predetermined number.*** Thus independent claims 1 and 29 are not rendered obvious by the cited references. Since claims 2-5, 58, 59, 61, 67, 68, 71, 73 and 74 directly or indirectly from claim 1, and since claims 30-33, 63, 64, 66, 69, 70, 75, 77 and 78 directly or indirectly depend from claim 29, these claims are similarly not rendered obvious by the Rorex and Davis patents.

***Group II: Claims 57 and 62***

First, since claims 57 and 62 depend from claims 1 and 29, respectively, these claims are not rendered obvious by the Rorex and Davis patents for at least the reasons discussed above with reference to the claims of Group I.

Second, these claims further recite that ***the predetermined number of the second plurality of search results is no less than a number of ads included on the generated search results page.*** In rejecting claims 57 and 62, the Examiner cites column 18, lines 26-36 of the Davis patent as teaching this feature. The Examiner contends that "the number of unpaid listings ***could obviously be*** equal to or greater than the number of relevant paid listings.... [Emphasis added.]" (Paper No. 20080513, page 8)

However, there is nothing in either the Rorex patent or Davis patent which teaches or suggests that the predetermined number of unpaid listings is no less than a number of ads included on the generated search results page. In fact, as discussed above with reference to the claims of Group I, the Davis patent might not display any unpaid listings if enough relevant paid listings are generated. Furthermore, Figure 7

of the Davis patent shows the number of ads (which the Examiner characterizes as the claimed first plurality of search results) is more than the number of unpaid listings (which the Examiner characterizes as the claimed second plurality of search results).

In view of the foregoing remarks, the Rorex and Davis patents do not teach, nor do they make obvious, that ***the predetermined number of the second plurality of search results is no less than a number of ads included on the generated search results page.*** Thus claims 57 and 62 are not rendered obvious by the cited references for at least this additional reason.

*Group III: Claims 60 and 65*

First, since claims 60 and 65 indirectly depend from claims 1 and 29, respectively, these claims are not rendered obvious by the Rorex and Davis patents for at least the reasons discussed above with reference to the claims of Group I.

Second, these claims are not rendered obvious by the Rorex and Davis patents because the cited references neither teach, nor do they make obvious, that the generated search results are ordered using a search score ***which is a function of an information retrieval score.*** In rejecting claims 60 and 65, the Examiner cites column 7, lines 12-34 of the Rorex patent as teaching this feature. (See Paper No. 20080513, page 8.) The appellant respectfully disagrees.

The present specification provides that the search results generated may include "scores related to the search results ***(e.g., information retrieval ("IR") scores such as dot products of feature vectors corresponding to a query and a***

***document...)***. [Emphasis added.]" (Page 11, lines 8-10) The order of the search results in the claimed invention may, for example, depend on the IR score. With everything else being equal, the higher the IR score, the higher the rank.

By contrast, the portion of the Rorex patent cited by the Examiner provides that "[t]he highest bid amount receives the highest rank value, the next highest bid amount receives the next highest rank value, proceeding to the lowest bid amount, which receives the lowest rank value." (The Rorex patent, col. 7, lines 24-27) Thus, the rank value of the generated search results is solely dependent on the bid amount. Therefore, the Rorex patent does not teach that the search score is a function of an information retrieval score (e.g., dot products of feature vectors corresponding to a query and a document).

Thus, claims 60 and 65 are not rendered obvious by the Rorex and Davis patents for at least this additional reason.

***Group IV: Claim 72 and 76***

First, since claims 72 and 76 indirectly depend from claims 1 and 29, respectively, these claims are not rendered obvious by the Rorex and Davis patents for at least the reasons discussed above with reference to the claims of Group I.

Second, the Rorex and Davis patents do not teach that ad creative information is determined using information automatically extracted from an advertiser Web page as recited in claims 72 and 76. In rejecting claims 72 and 76, the Examiner cites column 4, lines 59-61 and column 5, lines 35-51 of the Rorex patent. (See Paper No. 20080513, page 10.) The appellant respectfully disagrees.

Specifically, the portion of the Rorex patent cited by the Examiner provides that "[e]ach search listing record contains the URL of an associated web page or document, a title, descriptive text and a bid amount." (column 4, lines 59-61 of the Rorex patent) The cited portions further provide:

> A searcher clicks on the hyperlink with a computer input device such as a mouse to initiate a retrieval request to retrieve the information associated with the advertiser's hyperlink. Preferably, each access or click on a search result list hyperlink is redirected to the search engine web server 108 to associate the click with the account identifier for an advertiser. This redirection action, which is not apparent to the searcher, will access account information coded into the search result page before accessing the advertiser's URL using the search result list hyperlink clicked on by the searcher. In the illustrated embodiment, the advertiser's web site description and hyperlink on the search result list page is accompanied by an indication that the advertiser's listing is a paid listing. Each paid listing displays an amount corresponding to a price per click paid by the advertiser for each of referral to the advertiser site through this search result list.

(column 5, lines 35-51 of the Rorex patent)

Although the Rorex patent provides that each search record may include a URL and a bid amount, nowhere does it teach or suggest that ***ad creative information is determined using information automatically extracted from an advertiser Web page***. Thus claims 72 and 76 are not rendered obvious by the cited references for at least this additional reason.

## XIII. Claims appendix

An appendix containing a copy of the claims on appeal is filed herewith.

## IX. Evidence appendix

There is no evidence submitted pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.130, 1.131, or 1.132, nor is there any other evidence entered by the Examiner and relied upon by the appellant in the appeal.

## X. Related proceedings appendix

There are no decisions rendered by a court of the Board in any proceeding identified in section II above pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 41.38 (c) (1) (ii).

## Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, the appellant respectfully submits that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, the appellant requests that the Board reverse each of the outstanding grounds of rejection.

Any arguments made in this Appeal Brief pertain ***only*** to the specific aspects of the invention ***claimed***. Any arguments are made ***without prejudice to, or disclaimer of***, the appellant's right to seek patent protection of any unclaimed

(e.g., narrower, broader, different) subject matter, such as by way of a continuation or divisional patent application for example.

Since the appellant's remarks, amendments, and/or filings with respect to the Examiner's objections and/or rejections are sufficient to overcome these objections and/or rejections, the appellant's silence as to assertions by the Examiner in the Office Action and/or to certain facts or conclusions that may be implied by objections and/or rejections in the Office Action (such as, for example, whether a reference constitutes prior art, whether references have been properly combined or modified, whether dependent claims are separately patentable, etc.) is not a concession by the appellant that such assertions and/or implications are accurate, and that all requirements for an objection and/or a rejection have been met. Thus, the appellant reserves the right to analyze and dispute any such assertions and implications in the future.

Respectfully submitted,

January 20, 2009

Leonard P. Linardakis, Attorney
Reg. No. 60,441
Tel.: (732) 936-1400

**CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION**

I hereby certify that this paper (and any accompanying paper(s)) is being facsimile transmitted to the United States Patent Office on the date shown below.

Leonard P. Linardakis
Type or print name of person signing certification

Signature

January 20, 2009
Date

## CLAIMS APPENDIX PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 41.37 (c) (1) (viii)

Claim 1 (previously presented): A method for generating information for an online advertisement, the method comprising:

a) generating a first plurality of search results using a search query and an index of advertiser Web page information;

b) determining, for each of the first plurality of search results, at least one of (A) landing page information and (B) ad creative information using a corresponding one of the first plurality of search results;

c) generating, for each of the first plurality of search results, an ad using the determined at least one of a landing page information and ad creative information; and

d) generating a search result page including

i) at least a second plurality of search results corresponding to the search query, and

ii) the generated ads,

wherein the generated ads are maintained as distinct from the second plurality of search results on the search result page, and wherein the second plurality of search results is a predetermined number.

Claim 2 (original): The method of claim 1 wherein the ad creative information is determined using information excerpted from an advertiser Web page.

Claim 3 (original): The method of claim 1 wherein the ad creative information is determined using a text snippet of the search result.

Claim 4 (previously presented): The method of claim 1 wherein the ad creative information includes information excerpted from an advertiser Web page.

Claim 5 (original): The method of claim 1 wherein the landing page information is a URL included in the search result.

Claims 6-28 (canceled)

Claim 29 (previously presented): Apparatus for generating information for an online advertisement, the apparatus comprising:

one or more processors;

at least one input device; and

one or more storage devices storing processor-executable instructions which, when executed by one or more processors, perform a method of:

a) generating a first plurality of search results using a search query and an index of advertiser Web page information;

b) determining, for each of the first plurality of search results, at least one of (A) landing page information and (B) ad creative information using a corresponding one of the first plurality of search results;

c) generating, for each of the first plurality of search results, an ad using the determined at least

one of a landing page information and ad creative information; and

d) generating a search result page including

i) at least a second plurality of search results corresponding to the search query, and

ii) the generated ads,

wherein the generated ads are maintained as distinct from the second plurality of search results on the search result page, and wherein the second plurality of search results is a predetermined number.

Claim 30 (original): The apparatus of claim 29 wherein the ad creative information is determined using information excerpted from an advertiser Web page.

Claim 31 (original): The apparatus of claim 29 wherein the ad creative information is determined using a text snippet of the search result.

Claim 32 (previously presented): The apparatus of claim 29 wherein the ad creative information includes information excerpted from an advertiser Web page.

Claim 33 (original): The apparatus of claim 29 wherein the landing page information is a URL included in the search result.

Claims 34-56 (canceled)

Claim 57 (previously presented): The method of claim 1 wherein the predetermined number of the second plurality of

search results is no less than a number of ads included on the generated search results page.

Claim 58 (previously presented): The method of claim 1 wherein the first plurality of search results and the second plurality of search results are generated by the same search operations.

Claim 59 (previously presented): The method of claim 1 wherein the ads included on the generated search results page are ordered using a search score.

Claim 60 (previously presented): The method of claim 59 wherein the search score is a function of an information retrieval score.

Claim 61 (previously presented): The method of claim 59 wherein the search score is a function of a link analysis that assigns a numerical weighting to each element of a hyperlinked set of documents.

Claim 62 (previously presented): The apparatus of claim 29 wherein the predetermined number of the second plurality of search results is no less than a number of ads included on the generated search results page.

Claim 63 (previously presented): The apparatus of claim 29 wherein the first plurality of search results and the second plurality of search results are generated by the same search operations.

Claim 64 (previously presented): The apparatus of claim 29 wherein the ads included on the generated search results page are ordered using a search score.

Claim 65 (previously presented): The apparatus of claim 64 wherein the search score is a function of an information retrieval score.

Claim 66 (previously presented): The apparatus of claim 64 wherein the search score is a function of a link analysis that assigns a numerical weighting to each element of a hyperlinked set of documents.

Claim 67 (previously presented): The method of claim 1 wherein the predetermined number of the second plurality of search results is independent of a number of ads included on the generated search result page.

Claim 68 (previously presented): The method of claim 1 wherein the predetermined number of the second plurality of search results is more than a number of the ads included on the generated search result page.

Claim 69 (previously presented): The apparatus of claim 29 wherein the predetermined number of the second plurality of search results is independent of a number of ads included on the generated search result page.

Claim 70 (previously presented): The apparatus of claim 29 wherein the predetermined number of the second plurality of search results is more than a number of the ads included on the generated search result page.

Claim 71 (previously presented): The method of claim 1 wherein ad creative information is determined, for each of the first plurality of search results, and wherein the determined ad creative information is used to generate the ad for each of the first plurality of search results.

Claim 72 (previously presented): The method of claim 71 wherein the ad creative information is determined using information automatically extracted from an advertiser Web page.

Claim 73 (previously presented): The method of claim 71 wherein the ad creative information is determined using a text snippet of the corresponding search result.

Claim 74 (previously presented): The method of claim 71 wherein the ad creative information includes information automatically extracted from an advertiser Web page.

Claim 75 (previously presented): The apparatus of claim 29 wherein ad creative information is determined, for each of the first plurality of search results, and wherein the determined ad creative information is used to generate the ad for each of the first plurality of search results.

Claim 76 (previously presented): The apparatus of claim 75 wherein the ad creative information is determined using information automatically extracted from an advertiser Web page.

Claim 77 (previously presented): The apparatus of claim 75 wherein the ad creative information is determined using a text snippet of the search result.

Claim 78 (previously presented): The apparatus of claim 75 wherein the ad creative information includes information automatically extracted from an advertiser Web page.

## EVIDENCE APPENDIX PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 41.37 (c) (1) (ix)

There is no evidence submitted pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.130, 1.131, or 1.132, nor is there any other evidence entered by the Examiner and relied upon by the appellant in the appeal.

## RELATED PROCEEDINGS APPENDIX PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 41.37 (c) (1) (x)

There are no decisions rendered by a court of the Board in any proceeding identified in section II of the Appeal Brief pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 41.37 (c) (1) (ii).